LABOUR MONTHLY

1s.

EDITOR . R PALME DUTT

Political Danger Signals R.P.D.

British Trade With Eastern Europe Ben Parkin, M.P.

Social-Democracy in Europe—Left or Right? James Klugmann

Harriman and Cripps Margot Heinemann

DECEMBER, 1947

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXIX. No. 12

CONTENTS

December, 1947

	Page
Notes of the Month: *Political Danger Signals* by R. P. D.	353
British Trade with Eastern Europe by BEN PARKIN, M.P. ...	361
Social-Democracy in Europe—Left or Right? by JAMES KLUGMANN ...	364
Harriman and Cripps by MARGOT HEINEMANN ...	369
What happened in 1939 (*Speech* of A. Y. Vyshinsky)	374
100 Years Ago—Marx and Engels speak in London ...	378
Document of the Month— United Nations Resolution against Warmongers	380
Communication from J. Winternitz	381
Book Reviews— The Watershed by A. Calder-Marshall and Partisan Picture by Basil Davidson: *Kenneth Syers*	382
Life in Russia by John Lawrence: *Gordon Schaffer*	384

A CHRISTMAS GIFT

THAT WILL BE APPRECIATED—ALL THE YEAR ROUND

By a simple method we offer you an annual Xmas Gift to any of your friends, with something more than seasonal appreciation.

We offer LABOUR MONTHLY XMAS GIFT TOKENS for annual Postal Subscription at the following special rates:

1	Subscription	12/-
2	Subscriptions	21/-
3	„	30/-

Posted free to any friends at home or abroad every month from 1st January to 31st December, 1948.

POST THIS COUPON TODAY!

This special Xmas Gift offer will be valid from 1st November to 20th December, 1947.

Please send .....Xmas Gift Tokens with stamped, addressed envelopes, for which I enclose £ s. d.

NAME .....
BLOCK CAPITALS

ADDRESS .....

.....

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 Ballards Lane, Finchley, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Political Danger Signals

TEN years ago one of the present Government Ministers wrote about what happens to a Labour Government which in face of an economic crisis proceeds to carry out a programme of cutting the workers' standards in accordance with the demands of the capitalist class:

> **The orders of the capitalists are, of course, always the same. They are to solve the crisis at the expense of the workers. Any Left Government which begins to do this, as the British Labour Government did, is not only dead, but damned.**
>
> **It produces a gigantic wave of disillusionment among its own supporters, who, instead of the great concessions which they have been promised, actually begin to receive cuts from their own Government.**
>
> **If the capitalists can induce the leaders of the Labour movement to do this they are on the high road to destroy the whole working-class movement.**
>
> **(John Strachey in the "Daily Worker," January 15, 1937.)**

Thou hast said it. This will serve for our text this month.

Red Light

Last month's municipal elections have driven this lesson home for the most complacent. Tory policy begets Tory revival. As de Gaulle profits in France, so Churchill and Mosley profit in Britain. Hundreds of thousands of electors who swept forward in the common advance to cast out Toryism two years ago, who saw in Labour the banner of a new hope, now begin to lose heart, as they see their hopes unfulfilled and experience the old policies of cuts and worsened standards alongside rising profits of the rich, and even, in a wild and angry stampede of the less politically conscious, swing back to Toryism in despair, to the old vomit, because they see no alternative. The whole Left suffers for the crimes of the Labour Government. The new Emergency Budget, which places three-quarters of its additional burdens on the shoulders of the workers and lower incomes in order to pay for a reckless and extravagant foreign and arms policy absorbing one-third of the State's expenditure, increases the danger. And this is only the beginning; for the whips of Dalton are now to be replaced by the scorpions of Cripps. The third warning signal is the open re-emergence of Mosley under the protection of an array of police truncheons directed by a Labour Home Secretary to force fascism down the throats of the people. We are in danger of slipping back into the era of Chamberlain. But the new name of Chamberlain is Attlee. The new name of Hoare is Bevin. And the new name of Sir John Simon is Chuter Ede.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Municipal Elections

What happened in the municipal elections? Labour, which had won 1,359 seats in England and Wales in 1945, and 200 in 1946, lost 650 in 1947, losing control of many important towns, especially in Lancashire, and also lost over 60 seats in Scotland. The Communist Party lost 14 out of 22 seats in Britain. Toryism gained over 600 seats. This swing reflected an increased total vote. The Labour vote in England and Wales increased by half a million from 2,871,000 in 1946 to 3,385,000 in 1947, or an increase of 18 per cent. But the Tory and allied vote increased by nearly one and a half millions, from 2,629,000 to 4,095,000. Thus the Labour proportion of the total vote fell from 44.5 per cent. in 1946 to 39.7 per cent. in 1947; while the Tory vote rose from 40.7 per cent. to 48 per cent. The lesson is plain. The solid core of Labour remained solid. But a vast influx of floating voters, of the less politically conscious, who normally fail to vote in local elections, but whose numbers would inevitably include a proportion of Labour voters at the general election, swept to the polls because of the national situation to register their protest against the Labour Government by voting for the visible alternative or official opposition, Toryism. It was a stampede of angry sheep, of the most politically backward; but it was a stampede of which Toryism was able to take advantage.

A Swing to the Right

The brilliant efficiency of the two-party system of Anglo-American democracy, which is designed to rule out effective representation of the left by confronting the serious political supporter of an alternative left policy or third party with the problem of the "split vote" and thus confining the practical choice of the average elector to a choice between two official machines with closely similar policies, worked its magic once again to ensure, as in 1931, that the confused elementary protest of backward masses against the reactionary policy administered by a Labour Government should redound to the benefit of reaction.* It is significant that in the more politically developed

*In this connection it is interesting to note the present to-do in New York over proportional representation, which during the past decade has made possible democratic representation on the New York City Council and exposed the undemocratic character of the American two-party system. Prior to its adoption in 1936 the New York Board of Aldermen consisted of 64 Democrats and 1 Republican. After its adoption the New York City Council of 23 consists of 2 Communists, 2 American Labour Party (left wing labour, including Communists), 2 Liberals, 3 Republicans and 14 Democrats—a very different picture of American public opinion from the official picture presented by the House of Representatives, the Senate or Presidential elections, with their rigorous exclusion of the left. Needless to say, the official Republican and Democratic machines are now taking active steps to get rid of P.R., in order to safeguard their normal domination and restore the myth that Communism is "negligible" in the United States when it comes to political representation—although never negligible when a bogy is necessary for the Un-American Committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conditions in Scotland, in the regions with a stronger socialist and working class consciousness, where there was an effective choice between Communism and Labour, there in seven of the eight seats retained by Communism the Communist majority showed an increase over last year. This, however, could be in the circumstances no more than a sign of importance for the future

small pricks,
the baby figure of the giant mass
of things to come at large.

It could have no bearing on the general result. In general, Communism shared the setback of the whole Labour movement. The outcome of the municipal elections is the more serious because the measure of dissatisfaction and disillusionment found no outlet to the left, but only advantaged the right.

Political Trends

Further light on current political trends and popular opinion is afforded by the much discussed Gallup poll which was published in the *News-Chronicle* on November 5 immediately after the municipal elections. Despite obvious limitations, and some selectivity in presentation, this poll does afford a certain measure of opinion. This poll showed that, whereas Labour support had exceeded Tory support continuously since 1943 up to the present year, in March of this year, following the fuel crisis, the two lines met, and by August, following the convertibility crisis, Toryism drew ahead, reaching 44½ per cent. in September, against 40 per cent. for Labour—figures not far removed from the municipal election vote. Still more significant were the answers to detail questions. While there was this major vote for Toryism, and even a majority of 51 per cent. for either a Tory or National Government, nearly two-thirds, or 62 per cent., expressed no confidence in the capacity of Toryism to deal with the crisis. On all the questions asked there were only two issues on which popular opinion registered absolutely decisive majorities: food and housing: 66 per cent. were against food cuts, and 55 per cent. were against housing cuts. On both these issues popular opinion is thus registered in opposition equally to the Government's policy and to Tory policy; but this could find no reflection in the conditions of the municipal election.

Contradictory Tendencies

As soon, however, as this elementary mass demand is translated into political issues, confusion reigns. Thus on the armed forces, the inflation of which is the main effective cause of food cuts and housing cuts (" guns or butter "), only a little over a quarter or 28 per cent. were aware that these are too large; the majority of those who demanded the maintenance of food levels and no cuts in the housing programme had obviously never realised that these demands are incompatible with the maintenance of the present size of the armed forces. The nearest approach to a definite major trend on political

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issues, apart from the elementary mass demand for food and housing, is hostility to the American alliance; 34 per cent. disapproved the present policy in relation to the United States, as against 33 per cent. who approved. This may be compared with a previous poll showing 57 per cent. distrusting American aid as involving conditions infringing Britain's independence and 51 per cent. for rejection of aid under such conditions. On the other hand, on nationalisation and socialism the extremely limited range of political consciousness is most marked, only 9 per cent. finding that the Government's nationalisation policy had gone " not quickly enough," and only 15 per cent. finding the Government's policy " not socialist enough."

Lessons for the Left

Thus the politically conscious left (i.e., with full socialist consciousness) extends at present to only about one-sixth or one-seventh of the adult population. But on the concrete current issues of food, housing or the American alliance the main trends of popular opinion run counter to the official policy equally of the Labour Government and of Toryism. To this may be added the demand for the suppression of fascism, where a previous poll showed 57 per cent. demanding its suppression, while both the Labour Government and Toryism are in favour of using force to protect fascism. On all these concrete issues only the programme of the Communist Party in fact expresses the demands which are felt by the majority of popular opinion; but the Communist policy does not yet reach the overwhelming majority save as parodied by its opponents (99 per cent. of the press is actively anti-communist). Hence the elementary popular feeling, dissatisfaction and demand, arising from the crisis, is not yet translated into political consciousness. This is the problem confronting the Left in Britain today, which this Gallup poll reveals. It is essential to mobilise the full active strength and fight of the whole Labour movement to reverse the present policy of the Government, which is only playing into the hands of Toryism, and to champion a programme which really corresponds to the mass desires of the people. This is the decisive lesson of the municipal elections; and if this lesson is not learned quickly, the danger of a further swing to Toryism or even a Tory comeback could become grave.

His Master's Voice

But the municipal elections cannot be seen only in a national setting. They are a part of the general turnover to the Right in the official politics of all the " Marshall countries " (as they are now so delightfully termed in semi-official diplomatic utterance: why not 'Morgan's Empire' or, more simply and plainly, 'U.S. dependencies'?). They are part of the same trend as the de Gaulle-Vichy 40 per cent. vote in France, when two years ago de Gaulle had been driven out of French politics and only came back this year to found his Rally with the American Ambassador on the platform of his foundation meeting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at Strasbourg. The successes of the Right in the local elections in Britain and France have been openly acclaimed in the American press as victories for the Marshall Plan. "The first dividend on the Marshall Plan" was the *New York Times*' crudely cynical comment on Labour's defeats at the British municipal elections. The "cold war" in Western Europe has already been won, declares Walter Lippmann. The net is beginning to draw closer around the sixteen victim nations; and the mass struggles of the workers in France and Italy against home fascism and foreign domination already begin to recall the character of the resistance movements, just as in Greece the continuity of the liberation battle against the same oppressors under a shift of patronage is obvious. Yet there are still innocents who affect to see only altruistic philanthrophy of soft-hearted American millionaires in the Marshall Plan, and profess amazement at the suggestion of any incursion into domestic politics.

Hitler's Technique

What began as economic and financial intervention now begins to take on a more and more openly political character. The innocents will do well to remember the principle which Hitler laid down long ago in *Mein Kampf*:

> A shrewd conqueror will always enforce his exactions only by stages. . . The more numerous the extortions thus passively accepted, so much the less will resistance appear justified in the eyes of other people, if the vanquished nation should end by revolting against the last act of oppression in a long series. And that is especially so if the nation has already patiently and silently accepted impositions which were much more exacting.

Messrs. Marshall and Harriman have evidently studied the textbook of the Master to advantage. First the imposition of the conditions of the Loan Agreement; the surrender of trading and currency freedom; then the assault of the Geneva Treaty, to break down the structure of imperial preference; then the humiliation of the Paris Report, written and re-written under American dictation; then the Means Test of the visiting American Committees of 215 Congressmen flying over to inspect the resources of their new European estate; then the acceptance of the new Marshall proposal of an American "Supervising Agency" nominated by the President, with "local offices" in each Western European country (pardon, "Marshall country"); until finally in the official press of the vanquished countries the very idea of "national independence" begins to be scorned as an obsolete myth. The *Economist* writes (November 15):

> Some of the conditions foreshadowed in Mr. Marshall's statement do represent some infringement of national independence. And so they should.

How quickly the accents of Vichy are learned in some quarters. Let Hitler make the comment for the *Economist*:

> A people who have lost all strength of character—which is always the case with every nation that voluntarily submits to the threats of an opponent—will not find in any of these acts of oppression, if one be enforced apart from the other, sufficient grounds for resistance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Plain Speaking

Let us finish with the hypocrisy and soft-soap camouflage of philanthrophy and face the facts. The aims of the Marshall Plan are openly political and strategic. The Harriman Report states:

The interest of the United States in Europe cannot be measured simply in economic terms. It is also strategic and political. We all know that we are faced in the world today with two conflicting ideologies. One is a system in which individual rights and liberties are maintained. The opposing system is one where iron discipline by the state ruthlessly stamps out individual liberties.

Here the issue is plainly stated: "Individualism," i.e., Capitalism, versus Socialism or Communism. The Report goes on to declare that the task is to defeat "the Communist tactic" and proceeds:

Therefore the countries of Western Europe must be restored to a position where they may retain full faith in the validity of their traditional approaches to world affairs.

"Traditional approaches to world affairs," i.e., capitalism and imperialism. The issue is seen as Western Capitalism versus Communism. *Therefore* the dollars are held out as a bait to the Western European countries where the peoples have plainly shown their desire to change the social order.

"Another World War"

Marshall's position is summarised as follows by Stuart Gelder in the *News-Chronicle* (November 17):

Mr. Marshall does not believe that America can preserve her independence without fighting another world war for it if, through the economic disruption of Europe and Asia, Communists seize power in the whole of the Eastern Hemisphere. He believes this will occur if Europe and China collapse through economic and political exhaustion, and that Communist dominion over half the earth is the alternative to the Marshall Plan.

Bevin's role from the standpoint of the State Department is defined by the same correspondent:

"Without Bevin," said one of the State Department's top-planners to me this week, "Marshall would have been gesturing to an indifferent world. We regard it as proof of Britain's right to call herself a Great Power that one of her leaders saw that Marshall's imagination and American economic strength were the last defence of crumbling democracies against the inevitable rise of dynamic Communism."

"Another world war." "The last defence against the inevitable rise of Communism." That is the perspective of the Marshall Plan. That is the perspective of Bevin. The line-up is tolerably clear. On the one side, the peoples of Europe and Asia, with Communism in the vanguard, struggling for freedom and social justice, and "inevitably" advancing to Communism if left free from American intervention. On the other side, American Imperialism, as "the last defence" of Capitalism again Communism, backing reaction in Europe and Asia, with stooges of the Bevin-Blum-Schumacher type to do its work. For this purpose the dollars are held out as a bait. For this purpose Britain must be bled white to maintain two millions in the armed forces or supplying them, while ever greater shortages are imposed on the people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Emergency Budget, the municipal elections and the emergence of Mosley all fall into place as phases in this world battle planned by American Imperialism.

Paying the Bill

Why must additional taxation of £208 million be imposed by an Emergency Budget, of which roughly three-fourths falls on the workers and lower incomes and only one-fourth on a small proportion of the increased profits of the rich? Why must food subsidies be pegged, while prices rise, and subsidies on clothing be removed, thus ensuring a further rise in prices? Why must £200 million be withdrawn from capital construction, with the main blows falling on housing (the waiting lists for housing are now higher than at the end of the war), schools, hospitals, new factories or industrial re-equipment? The dulcet tones of the B.B.C. announcers and the united Tory-Labour statesmen and the star journalists explain with weary patience to the people, in elementary terms like a schoolmaster explaining the rules of arithmetic to a population of morons, that there is danger of inflation, that the people have too much money in their pockets, that there are too few goods, that taxation is necessary to prevent too much money chasing too few goods, and all the rest of the dreary parrot rigmarole. Fiddlesticks and blarney of the purest water. The people are not quite so dumb as their mentors think. Every worker and housewife knows that, so far from having too much money burning a hole in their pockets, they are finding it more and more difficult to make ends meet and chase after the ever-rising prices. The sinking figures of working class savings show that. Yes, there is a danger of inflation; there is already a measure of inflation. But it does not arise from the workers. It arises from the sources where the preaching pundits never dare look. It arises because £900 million a year, or three to four times pre-war, are being poured out on the armed forces, that is, are being thrown into circulation without production of goods. It arises because two millions of the working population are withdrawn in this way to consume without producing. It arises because hundreds of millions of additional profits even above war heights are swelling dividends, swelling undistributed profits that escape taxation, and thus distorting economic demand from national needs and distorting production. It arises because we are paying through the nose to maintain reaction and fascism in the four corners of the earth and fulfil the obligations of the Anglo-American Alliance. Cut the £900 million by half (still leaving nearly double pre-war), and it would more than cover all the additional taxation of the Emergency Budget and all the cuts so far in capital construction. Mr. Bevin is an expensive luxury. So long as we tolerate Bevin, so long as we dance to the American tune, we must pay, pay, pay.

"Saving Western Civilisation"

Yes. We are paying for the honour of "saving Western civilisation"—the civilisation of Buckingham Palace, Royal Weddings,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Waldorf-Astoria Hotels, Hearst and Hollywood—and severed heads in Greece. We are paying for the honour of being " the last bastion " in Europe against Communism. Has not Bevin proclaimed to " My dear Americans " at the Savoy Hotel that " we won't let you down," that " Britain is a great bastion in Europe " for " Western civilisation," that " standards of life may go back " for the workers, but " we won't fail "? Has not the British Ambassador in New York declared that the Labour Government represents the " banner " for Europe of the " alternative to the lead formerly given by Russia "? Has not Sir Hartley Shawcross declaimed to the Foreign Press Association in New York that Britain will never be " tyrannised or subjugated by either of the competing extremes of State Socialism or unbridled Capitalism," and then had to correct his slip by explaining amid laughter that by " State Socialism " he meant, of course, " Communism "? And has not Sir Oswald Mosley joined the happy throng to proclaim the pure gospel of Bevin, that Britain must link up with America

> to preserve the remnants of Western civilisation. Western Union to save the world from the barbarians.

What a chorus! What unanimity! In the holy unanimity of this sacred cause, taken over from Hitler, can we be surprised that a Labour Government should call out the police to protect Mosley and Fascism from the anger of the people, when British soldiers are being employed to protect the Nazi police state of terror and torture in Greece? Can we spread plague abroad and expect to escape it at home?

Awake and Fight

The signs are indeed at danger. The municipal elections are only one warning signal of many. The present course of the Government is not only shaming and discrediting the Labour movement and driving large sections of the people into the arms of Toryism. It offers no perspective save increasing cuts, and, at the end of all the cuts, according to Cripps' own statement, " economic strangulation " or helpless dependence on the dollar. And President Truman's Address has shown that interim dollar aid is to go first and foremost to Germany, Austria, Italy and French reaction, not to Britain; and that Britain is to be left first to sink to deeper bankruptcy and impotence, with prospective exhaustion of the final gold reserves (which are already being used up as rapidly as the old dollar loan), in order to be reduced finally to the position of a completely dependent American satellite. The choice between surrender and independence will be more difficult then than now. The time to fight is now. Only the speedy awakening of the whole Labour movement can change the present course, prevent a Tory come-back, organise production to raise standards, end the ruinous alliance with American reaction, and go forward with the free progressive peoples for economic recovery and international peace.

November 17, 1947. R. P. D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITISH TRADE WITH EASTERN EUROPE

By BEN PARKIN, M.P.

[We are pleased to print this article from Mr. Parkin, who is chairman of the Trade and Industrial Committee of the Labour Party in Parliament and was one of the six Members of Parliament who visited in October a series of Eastern European countries.—Ed. L.M.]

IN places where they talk politics the slanging matches continue, and the war hysteria mounts in intensity. Meanwhile, those who are more sincerely concerned for Britain's economic future in a peaceful world, become more and more worried at the, apparently, inexplicable slowness in building up trade relations alternative to those which can only lead to dollar domination. In the early months after the end of the war only the American continent could supply us with the food and raw materials we needed. Common sense dictates that at the earliest opportunity as many as possible of these things must be obtained from countries where they can be paid for with goods that Britain makes.

There happens to be a clause in the Anglo-Soviet Treaty which binds the two parties to render each other every economic aid after the end of the war. It also happens that at the General Election of 1945, the most wildly applauded paragraphs in any speeches were those which assumed that Socialist Britain would work hand in hand in planned economic reconstruction with the liberated countries of Europe. Apart from these obligations of pledged honour and Socialist faith, it is a fact that in all the world the countries of eastern Europe are those most in need of the things which Britain can produce, and best fitted to send us the goods we most urgently need.

It is known that this common sense view is accepted by the Ministers in the Labour Government most concerned with the development of our trade, as well as by the vast mass of Labour supporters who feel that no foreign policy, let alone a British Socialist foreign policy, can be independent unless it is based on a healthy, vigorous and viable economy.

It is clear, too, that the Soviet Government is anxious for the development of trade with us, not only to help the economies of both countries, but to provide a firm basis for the improvement of political relations and so to guarantee the peace of Europe and the world. Stalin told the Labour M.P.s who visited him recently that if the United States and Britain wish to improve their relations with the Soviet Union, then they will be welcome and " we shall be prepared to go forward to meet them, irrespective of what the economic set up may be of those countries. Co-operation between countries having

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different economic systems is quite possible." These words were quoted by Molotov in his speech during the 30th anniversary celebrations.

The facts about the trade negotiations which broke down are well known. The Soviet Union offered one million tons of grain this year, one and a half million next year, and two million for each of the following two years. They also offered timber increasing in quantity as their own means of cutting and transporting it improved. Light steel rails and timber cutting machinery were some of the things they most urgently wanted from us. It is known that delivery dates from our side presented a difficulty, but the Soviet Government were prepared to accept, during the early part of the contracts, deliveries of goods equal to only one-third of the value of what they were sending us. It appears, moreover, that at the end of the talks they were not asking for dollars in payment—perhaps because they were better advised than the British Government as to the likely duration of the "convertibility."

The formal breaking-off of negotiations was on the subject of revised terms of repayment under the war time Civil Supplies Agreement. The Russians have the feeling that they did not do less well than France in the war, and that we might give them the same terms as we have since given to France, even if it cost us four or eight million pounds. No one knowing the eagerness of the negotiators on both sides to secure an agreement can believe that this was the real cause of the breakdown. It is clear that someone at top level on one side thought that the other side was either unwilling or, for some reason, unable to conclude an agreement. As there is good reason for hoping that negotiations may re-open at any moment the less said on that subject the better.

There are other negotiations making progress at the present time, namely, with the Yugoslavs, who have had a trade delegation in London for some months. There is every indication that on purely commercial grounds agreement can be reached, and, in fact, it will be a great disappointment if an announcement has not been made before these words appear in print. The initial British request for deliveries of maize this year was vastly higher than U.N.R.R.A. reports last spring dared to suggest that Yugoslavia would be able to supply. It will be remembered that last year, owing to the fact that their statistical services, like most other things, were only just being built up, the Yugoslav Government generously let the Albanians have ten thousand tons and lent another twenty thousand to Rumania to help them out of their difficulty, thereby putting a heavy strain on their own rationing system. Since the maize harvest is only just being completed, it is not surprising that their first offers were cautious, and there is no excuse for contemptuously referring to them as "chicken feed," for it is, in fact, chicken feed that we desperately need to implement our live stock programme at home. It will soon be revealed, however, that the Yugoslavs have offered an astonishingly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high figure of grain this year, as well as very large quantities of other foods such as bacon, ham and edible oils over the next four years.

But they, too, in exchange for firm promises of food, want firm delivery dates of British goods which they require to carry out their own five year development plan.

Instead of being a deterrent, this question of delivery dates ought to be seized on by our Government as the best possible aid to increased production at home. It is no doubt very important to keep on repeating to slow-witted economists and the F.B.I. that the deficit in our balance of payments is £600,000,000 per year, but this formidable array of noughts is quite meaningless to the ordinary citizen who has had his bacon ration cut. Broken down into targets, industry by industry and factory by factory, accepted by the Trade Unions and Works Councils and set against the corresponding benefits in increased imports, it could provide the key to the application of practical planned Socialism in British industry. It would inevitably carry with it, without argument, the corollaries of planned and directed exports, of democratically accepted tasks, of stabilising basic wages, prices and profits, and the incentives of increased awards for increased production. With proper publicity Socialist enthusiasm and Socialist competition could be given full rein—so many saws, so many machines, so many generators by a certain date mean so much timber for so many houses for your local Council, so much bacon for the breakfast table, so much tobacco at a reasonable price, so many tons of feeding stuffs for our own agricultural programme, so many weeks nearer to the abolition of the bread ration.

Finally, there is the inestimable advantage that we are dealing with people having planned and expanding economies. The faster we and they carry out our reconstruction the sooner we shall be exchanging higher quality, better finished, consumer goods. The tremendous momentum of enthusiasm and hard work which has enabled the Yugoslavs to make a miraculous recovery from the devastation of war will be carried forward in the construction of the new economy. Three-quarters of their railway bridges were destroyed and most of the tracks torn up, only two small ports could receive ships, 26 per cent. of their industrial equipment was put out of action, and 60 per cent. of their coal mines severely damaged. By now the railways are restored, the coal output is three-quarters of pre-war and going up, and the extent of the agricultural recovery is shown by the figures of exports which they are able to offer—but it must be understood that these exports are offered at a sacrifice. Their standard of living before the war was appallingly low. The six hundred thousand tons of grain exported annually were "hunger exports." They are prepared to delay their own higher consumption if it will speed up their own Plan.

A similar situation exists in Poland. We already have a three year trade agreement with that country, negotiated in June of this year. Yet so great has been the speed of their recovery that the Poles are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already thinking in terms of an extension of this trade. Before the war we took one-fifth of Polish exports, just a little below the quantity taken by Germany and Austria. Forty per cent. of their pre-war exports were agricultural and timber products. Before the war their agricultural territories were greatly over-populated. It was estimated that the man power could be reduced by twenty-five per cent. without loss of production. Many changes have already taken place, but it is estimated that they could transfer another three million from agriculture to industry and still carry out their programme to increase food production. Seven per cent. of pre-war agricultural production was available either for export or higher consumption. By the end of 1949 it is expected that twenty per cent. will be thus available, and the Poles are already facing the decision how far to eat more of the luxury food themselves and how far to let themselves be attracted by the sort of goods which British industry can produce. Their best and most permanent type of agricultural export will be ham, bacon, pork, poultry, eggs, sugar and fish, known in economists' jargon as "highly processed luxury foods"—a phrase only properly understood when you have paid a visit to "Spolem," the Polish equivalent of the Co-operative Wholesale Society.

Such are the prospects of the exchange of products of British workers and those of our eastern European allies.

Who dares to stand between them?

SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE —LEFT OR RIGHT?

By JAMES KLUGMANN

BY their constant struggle against the unity of the working class, by their unbroken hostility to the Soviet Union, by their hatred of Communism and the Communist Parties which was greater than their hatred of capitalism or reaction, the leaders of European social-democracy between the wars played no small role in paving the way for Hitler, the Munich capitulation and the Second World War. In the course of this war, tens of thousands of members of these Social-Democratic Parties, whose countries had been attacked or occupied by Hitler, watched from afar the amazing advance of the Red Army which they had been told by the leaders to fear or despise; in many cases (in Eastern Europe for instance) they were liberated by the Red Army; they saw, too, the Communists leading the movements of national liberation and resistance against the Axis, and often fought side by side with them or under their leadership. Those socialist workers, peasants, intellectuals, vowed that never again would they return to the old theory and practice of right-wing social democracy, and that liberation would see them continuing the struggle for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialism alongside the Communist Parties. Thus at the end of the war the Polish, Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Rumanian and Italian Socialist Parties broke sharply with their old traditions and habits, removed from office many of their old leaders, and resumed activities along new progressive lines. In other countries of Europe, however, the old leaders of social-democracy, particularly those who had spent the war in emigration, out of contact with their people or under the supervision of Transport House, learned nothing and understood nothing. When the war was over, in France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, and Western Germany, with the benevolent support of the right-wing leaders of the British Labour Party, they returned to their stations to resume their actions against the working class. Later, under pressure from Britain and the United States, small splinter groups of reactionary socialists split off from those Parties that had opted for unity of action with the Communists—Giuseppe Saragat in Italy, Titel Petrescu in Rumania, Lulcheu in Bulgaria, Karolyi Peyer in Hungary. In greater or lesser degree, on issues both practical and theoretical, the struggle of these two wings, those for and those against the unity of the working class, continues and is deepening in every European Social-Democratic Party.

It is on the key political issues of the present day: attitude to unity of the working class, attitude to the Soviet Union and the new democracies of Eastern Europe, attitude to expansionist policy of American imperialism, attitude to socialist theory, to Marxism—that the deep differences, in theory and practice, between the two wings of European social-democracy are most clearly expressed.

* * * *

In Italy and Eastern Europe close co-operation and unity of action has developed between the Socialist and Communist Parties. The strength of the working class has been increased together with its influence in the general political field. The Pact of Unity of Action between the Italian Socialist and Communist Parties of October 27th, 1946, and the Unity Pact of November 28th, 1946, between the Polish Socialist Party and the Polish Workers' Party, laid down the basis and machinery of co-operation at all levels. Similar pacts exist in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, whilst in Rumania the stage is set for moving forward towards the organic unity of the two parties.

In these countries the Socialist Parties have no " enemy on the left ", whatever efforts right wing leaders of the British Labour Party or the American Federation of Labour have made to win them over. Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of Poland and General Secretary of the Polish Socialist Party, writes:

" Nor do we forget those who today profess a deep love for the Polish Socialist Party, but they love us, not because we are Socialists. They flirt with us because, flattered by imaginary hopes, they hope that we will, in the interests of Polish reaction, start a fight, say against the Polish Workers' Party. The reactionaries hope that first we will dispose of the Communists, and then, when we stand alone, reaction will be able to dispose of us."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Julian Hochfeld, chairman of the Parliamentary Group of the Polish Socialists, writes in the Polish monthly *Socialist Review*:

"The first principle is that the united workers' front is not regarded by the Polish Socialists as a tactical device but as an absolute concept . . . The task of the workers' movement in Europe can only be carried out by a United Front. The Socialist movement, and we have done this in Poland, must clearly state that its path is always to the left."

Or again witness the Italian Socialist leader Nenni:

"The unity of the working class attracts and does not repel the middle classes; the whole nation and especially the middle classes will soon convince themselves that a strong Socialist Party working jointly with the Communist Party is the best guarantee against civil war and totalitarianism."

Against this thesis of unity stands in utter contrast the attitude in theory and practice of the right wing socialist leaders, including those who hide behind leftist phraseology. Blum and Guy Mollet (France), de Brouckère (Belgium), Pollak (Austria), Schumacher (Germany), Saragat (Italy) and their ilk fight under slogans of "opposition to communism and fascism," "against the dictatorship of the right or left," the "middle way" or the "third force," which make them (true to the tradition of the old renegades, Kautsky, Otto Bauer or Scheidemann) splitters of the working class and progressive forces, allies of capitalism at home and abroad, white hopes of the Foreign Office and the U.S. State Department.

Take as an outstanding example Leon Blum and the leadership of the French Socialist Party. In the first elections after liberation the two French working class parties together obtained an absolute majority in the new Constituent Assembly. The position was favourable to lead the French people forward, continuing the élan and enthusiasm of the Resistance towards a new popular democracy crippling the power of the French trusts. Yet Blum declared that "the only possible solution" was tripartite alliance with the French Catholic Party, the M.R.P. From that moment the struggle of the French Socialist leaders against unity has become progressively sharper. The offer of the French Communists for a Pact of Unity of Action was refused; under American orders the Communist Party, largest political party in France, was ejected from the Government. In the recent municipal elections the French Socialists joined with the Gaullists and M.R.P. to defeat Communist candidates. The Socialist victories were at the expense of the Communists. In the belt of suburbs around Paris, where the Socialists received 10 per cent. of the votes against 45 per cent. of the Communists, Socialist candidates were elected by the Gaullists. At Choisy-le-Roi, for example, where the Communist Party had 13 out of 27 seats on the Council, a Socialist Mayor was elected by 10 Gaullists, 2 M.R.P., and 2 Socialists. Thus Blum's policy of the "third force," aimed, so he states, at holding at equal distance communists and fascists, ends by leading to unity with French reaction against the French working class. It weakens and disintegrates the Socialist Party itself, whose vote fell from 4,500,000 to 2,700,000 in the first year after liberation, and who, in the last municipal elections,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

won seats from the Communists with Gaullist votes, but *lost to the right* its main traditional centres including Mulhouse, Bordeaux, Nancy, Nice, and Lille, which had been administered by Socialists for fifty previous years.

* * * *

The same sharp divide is clear in social-democratic theory and practice with regard to the Soviet Union. The Social-Democratic Parties of Eastern Europe, without exception, stand for the closest economic and political relations of their countries with the Soviet Union. They appreciate the role of the Soviet Union as the principal force fighting in the world for peace. They support the struggles of the Soviet delegates at the United Nations Organisation. Arpad Szakasits, General Secretary of the Hungarian Socialists, on November 2nd, 1947, asks:

"Can one imagine a firmer basis for the hopes of every true Socialist for the victory of democracy throughout the world than the Soviet Union? Through the fact of its existence alone, the Soviet Union is an inexhaustible source of strength for the peoples striving for freedom, for the Socialist Movement. All bellicose intentions are shattered against the granite wall which the Soviet Union and the people rallied round her represent."

This position, again, sharply contrasts with that of the right wing leaders of European Social-Democracy, Blum, Pollak, Prieto, Schumacher, inspired by the fountain head of anti-Soviet outlook, Mr. Bevin, in the true tradition of Kautsky, Otto Bauer, Hilferding, Adler, Schevenels, etc.

* * * *

The Socialist leaders of Eastern Europe, the leaders of the Italian Socialist Party and an ever-growing number of militant members of the other Social-Democratic Parties are taking a firm stand for defence of the national independence of their country and resistance to the economic and political encroachments of U.S. imperialism. The Social-Democratic Parties of these countries supported the development of economic plans independent of an American loan with political conditions. The Socialist leaders of Eastern Europe rejected the Marshall "Plan" whilst the Italian Socialist leader Nenni warned the Italian people of what economic dependence on America would mean in terms of catastrophe for the Italian people.

The Polish Socialist Party, in its resolution of October 21st, 1947, states:

"In the U.S.A. the forces of the great capitalist counter-offensive have come to power. That country, which enriched itself during the war at the cost of the whole world, has developed into the symbol and hope of world capitalism. In consequence the U.S.A. has started a policy of the iron hand in both internal and external politics. Around the U.S. dollar offensive are grouped today all the parties of European and non-European reaction, all the remnants of defeated Fascism, recruited by U.S. imperialism. In many countries, right-wing Socialist politicians are surrendering to the dollar offensive, and then actually becoming defenders of the interests of U.S. imperialism."

The "inspiration" of Saragat, Peyer and Petrescu to split off from the main Socialist bodies in their countries was provided directly by U.S.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reaction, often working through the right-wing leaders of the American Federation of Labour. Mr. Spaak, Belgium's right-wing Socialist Premier, speaks of the Marshall "Plan" as a front erected against Communism. Schumacher, leader of Social-Democracy in Western Germany, who according to the editorial of the Italian socialist paper, "very much reminds one of Ebert, President of the Weimar Republic," is in process of changing masters and replacing British by American influence. M. Léon Blum has carried out without respite a campaign of persuading France and Europe to accept the "leadership" of the United States. In mid-August in an article on the "International Economic Problem," he called for the adoption of a "plan for an international economic organisation initiated by the United States" and attacked the Soviet Union for defending the "outworn notion" of national sovereignty. He called for, and then loudly supported the Marshall "Plan." He whitewashed, advertised, proclaimed aloud and everywhere the pure, unselfish motives of the American trusts. The United States, he declared, had no need to export. "For my part I believe in the true disinterestedness of the United States." He himself, during his visit to Washington, took the initiative in organising the American economic penetration of France. Small wonder that in March, 1946, the American journal *Life*, on the occasion of Blum's arrival in the U.S., should write in large letters, "Welcome, M. Blum," and explain to its readers, that whatever suspicion of Blum they might have as a sort of French "New-Dealer," they should remember that he stood *now* for the reintegration of France in the West.

* * * *

Thus in theory and practice the right-wing leaders of European Social-Democracy become agents and instruments of the main reactionary force within the world—American imperialism, which in the field of world politics is receiving such strong and consistent support from the Labour Government of Attlee and Bevin and the Socialist Government of Ramadier. In theory and practice the Socialist Parties of Eastern Europe and Italy (though there are still, of course, difficulties and hesitation) move closer to their Communist comrades, unite the working-class forces, jointly combat reaction, foreign and internal, move towards ideological unity, and prepare the way to realise the ambition of all that is best in the European Labour movement—organic unity, single parties of the working class. Within all the Socialist Parties of Europe, *whatever their leadership,* there is a strong and growing current in favour of the unity of the working class. Inside Britain, though, with the different structure of the British Labour Party and the Labour movement, it takes different forms, the struggle between these two wings of the socialist movement develops and grows tenser. This development will form the theme of a later article.

The struggle between the two wings has become sharper at each of the six successive International Socialist Conferences held since the end of 1944 (London, December, 1944; London, March, 1945; Clacton-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on-Sea, May, 1946; Paris, August, 1946; Zürich, June, 1947). It will be reflected clearly at the next conference at Brussels, this December, when the two burning issues of reconstitution of the Second International and admission of the German Social-Democratic Party will once again come up for discussion.

In this struggle a heavy responsibility lies on the British Labour movement to combat the influence of the right wing leaders of the Labour Party who thus far have exercised so sinister an influence on the international social-democratic movement since the end of the Second World War.

HARRIMAN AND CRIPPS

By MARGOT HEINEMANN

THE report of the Harriman Committee on the Marshall plan should help to end any remaining illusions in the Labour movement that Britain's economic troubles are going to be solved by gaining the goodwill of American big business. This 400-page report is the real blue print for American aid to Europe—on American capitalism's terms. The "democratic" planning of the Paris conference of 16 countries has served its purpose as a façade and can be pushed aside.

The total estimated dollar aid requirements of Western Europe were already scaled down at Paris, on American pressure, to $22,100 mn. up to 1951. The Harriman report proposes to supply only three-fifths of the total dollar aid asked for ($12,000 to $14,600 mn. over the whole period), and Europe's imports must be reduced accordingly. For example, coalmining equipment from U.S. is cut from $994 mn. to $140 mn., and steel scrap from $272 mn. to nil. But "the programme written at Paris may have to be modified by a shift in the amounts going to the separate countries. We believe that the amount of aid allotted to Germany may have to be higher than was set at Paris." German industry is to be built up; in other European countries present capital expenditure plans are considered excessive. "Housing programmes and capital development may have to be slowed down until European recovery is much more advanced than at present." Britain, in particular, is building too many ships—we ought to cut down on the Clyde and Tyne and hire American tonnage. But the British Government's general economic policy gets a special pat on the head:

> "It is a sign of hope that to an increasing degree British Government and opinion are realising the necessity of cutting down on non-essential industries and concentrating on essentials."

The Harriman Committee, however, are taking no chances. The aims are openly political, anti-Communist, but also against capitalist competitors. "Continued adherence to basic democratic principles

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[as defined by Wall Street] is an essential condition for aid." And therefore " the committee cannot emphasise too strongly that any aid must be on a year to year basis," and closely controlled by a U.S. official in each country. Europe is to be in no position to plan its future, which must rest from year to year in the lap of U.S. business.

Brown Bros. Harriman, the National City Bank of New York, General Electric Co., Studebaker Corpn., Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Corporation, Ayrshire Collieries Co., are among the concerns whose directors are on the Harriman Committee. It is their policy that is to determine the level of industrial development in Europe and in each country within Europe, and Mr. Marshall's statements on Nov. 11th endorse their line.

Seen in this setting, the present economic policy of the British Government, summarised by Cripps in Parliament on October 23rd, is in practice placing Labour Britain more and more at the mercy of U.S. big business—this is why the Harriman Committee commends it. The appeal often made to loyal Labour supporters is: " Endure these sacrifices now, explain the need for them to the people, so that in two years' time we shall be independent, able to stand on our own feet and resist a Tory come-back." But the Cripps policy, carefully examined, means just the opposite.

Britain's adverse balance of payments, at the present rate, is still about £900 mn. a year. The policy put forward by Cripps to deal with this is as follows:

(1) Further cuts in imports. Cuts decided up to August amounted to £228 million a year. Additional dollar cuts announced on October 23rd are £100 million for non-food goods (including timber, steel, tobacco and machinery), and a further £66 million for food (involving cuts in consumption for sugar, dried egg, meat and bacon).

(2) Exports to increase by £31 mn. a month (one-third above the end of 1946 and 60% above 1938) by the end of next year, materials and finished goods being diverted from the home market for that purpose.

(3) Capital construction and equipment to be cut by £200 mn. a year—nearly a fifth of present net capital expenditure.

(4) Restrictions on the purchasing power of the mass of the people by wage-pegging, removal of some subsidies, further indirect taxes.

The obvious fact is that the home consumer is to get much less. His diet before the war gave 3,000 calories of energy, now 2,870; in future it will be only 2,700, and that in a far less palatable and easily digestible form. New houses are to be cut to 140,000 a year—about half the present rate of construction. The export plans for all textiles mean that if production remains at the present level, supplies of cotton cloth for the home market will fall by 25%, and of woollen cloth by half. A growing number of good-quality goods will be made for export only.

The autumn Budget, unsensational, does nothing to lessen inflationary pressure from swollen bank balances of capitalists (both profits and dividends, after the new taxes, will be higher than in 1946). It does give another twist to the screw for working people. Another

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

£151 mn. a year of indirect taxes, falling heaviest on the workers, and £33 mn. taken off the subsidies on utility shoes and clothing, cost together 6/- a week extra for the average family. But extra profits taxes take only £57 mn.—over 3/- indirect tax for every 1/- out of profits. And this is only the end of the beginning. Prices are rising (the rise of 2.1% in October was the largest monthly wholesale rise for seven years), and in future food subsidies will not be increased to stabilise them.

Yet with all this "austerity," even if the Government's admittedly optimistic export targets were achieved, Britain would be more dependent than ever on American aid. By the end of 1948, Cripps estimates, the gold and dollar reserves of the sterling area would be down from £580 mn. to a bare £270 mn.; while imports and exports as a whole should balance, the dollar deficit would still be running at £250 mn. a year.

Cripps, indeed, made it clear that the Government is still relying on the Marshall Plan to prevent bankruptcy. It is, apparently, prepared to gamble that either another £250 mn. a year loan to Britain will be forthcoming; or at least the U.S.A. will lend dollars to European and other countries on a scale that will enable them to buy our goods and pay us in dollars. This is hardly even an outside chance. If American business does lend the dollars, what assurance is there that it will not also want to supply the exports? Meanwhile, Britain's main potential advantage in the export field—the power to plan ahead to exchange necessary imports of food and materials for coal and manufactured exports—is (under American pressure) not being used at all.

In so far as the Government can influence matters without planning trade (e.g., through raw material controls) it is pressing exporters to concentrate on dollar markets. "Exporters cannot go wrong in giving first priority to Canada, the United States, the Argentine and other markets in the American continent" (Cripps). The Dominions in the sterling area, and the colonies, are advised that the best help they can give Britain is to do without British goods, so that more can go to dollar areas. The Soviet Union and the Yugoslavs are told that the British Government cannot give any delivery dates for machinery in exchange for definite deliveries of food; and the Yugoslav trade delegation, left to secure such dates from individual British firms, finds them full up. Planned trade cannot get started; non-dollar suppliers cannot get production going; if there is any priority at all it is for unplanned trade.

The reduction of £200 mn. in capital equipment at home is a triumph for the policy urged both by the Harriman Committee, and by the F.B.I. in their deputation to Cripps last September (true, they asked for £400 mn., but it all helps). Only indications of definite cuts so far relate to Government expenditure on social services and nationalised industries. Besides housing, proposed cuts are for new

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factory building, railway equipment and electrification, roads, schools and hospitals, electrical supply development; there has even been " some trimming " of immediate re-equipment programmes for coal and electricity. Industrial machinery is to be diverted for export (the export target for end-1948 for textile machinery is 85% of present production, for machine tools 75%), without any plans, so far, to make good this production for the home market. Private managements are therefore "appealed to" to postpone buying machinery which is not absolutely essential. Thus Britain, with a productivity of one-third of America's, cuts investment to the level of a normal pre-war year—not even adding anything to make up for wartime arrears. The main cuts fall on social services and nationalised industry. The Armed Forces still cost £900 mn. this year. No wonder Mr. Harriman is pleased!

The main reason for this policy is not the shortage of steel and timber. If it were, the Government would be showing more concern to increase steel supplies (by better scrap collection and the construction of blast furnaces at wartime speed), to allocate steel strictly in engineering, and to expand timber supplies from Eastern Europe by supplying the needed woodcutting machinery. Conditions would be improved in the mines to attract the labour needed, so that France and Belgium could send us steel in exchange for coal. Above all, use of steel for the Forces would be cut.

If the Government has no crisis strategy, the British employers have; and it is their policy which is forcing its way through with American approval. Mr. Roy Harrod's recent popular book, " Are these Hardships Necessary?" states their line clearly enough.* Britain's present difficulties, he says, are due to trying to do too much, and thereby providing too many jobs for the workers and too many buyers for the products. We suffer from full employment, which necessitates planning and control, allocation of raw materials, price control and rationing. If we cut down capital investment (for preference, investment in the basic industries), full employment will disappear; workers will return to the lower-paid and under-manned industries; the distribution of goods will no longer require control and rationing schemes; price control and rent restrictions can be removed, and the " magic " of the price mechanism will ensure that the right goods are produced in the right quantities. It is on this anti-Labour logic that the Government is now acting.

The main effect of the cuts will, in fact, be to create some unemployment, and thus enable the " normal " laws of capitalist economy to operate. " The necessary cutting down of our investment programme should add to the availability of labour for agriculture." (Cripps). In cotton and woollen textiles, where recruitment over the last six months has been negligible, " the creation of certain availabili-

*No disrespect is intended to the F.B.I. memorandum, the *Economist* leading articles, the recent writings of Professor Robbins, or, indeed, to Mr. Harriman himself; all have used the same arguments.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties" (a lovely Crippsian phrase) should man up the mills. Sir Graham Cunningham, F.B.I. nominee on the Government's Economic Planning Board (which is to examine in more detail the plans for reducing capital expenditure), has said quite frankly (October 22nd): "Our economy is such that you must have a reserve of unemployed labour on which industry can draw. The future of industry is to tend toward some measure of unemployment and a national wages policy."

The effects of capital cuts on the future efficiency and competitive power of British industry must be shattering. Take for example textiles (which are still expected to provide a fifth of our future exports). The British cotton and woollen industries are notoriously so backward in equipment that output per worker is less than half that with American methods. Urgent minimum re-equipment needs in cotton spinning and weaving were assessed by the Working Party at £67 mn., and for wool at £28 mn. But the total output of textile machinery is only about £32 mn. a year, and the export target for end-1948 is £28 mn. Unless production increases (and there are no plans to extend manufacture beyond the present inefficient combine) the home mills will get only £4 mn. worth of machinery, compared with the present £15 mn.; and these urgent programmes will take about 30 years to complete.

In practice, what is now proposed by the Government is "redeployment of labour" on the old textile machinery—two-shift working, overtime, and intensification of work, without giving the workers the proper tools to do the job. This is exactly the line advocated by the employers' minority on the Working Party, and strongly resisted by the trade union representatives at the time.

If the industry does once again get labour on this basis—due to unemployment and direction—the problem will not be solved. In the long run, cheap labour cannot compete with automatic looms, as Lancashire well knows. The role of the British industry is to supply immediate needs now, and be driven to the wall by American and Japanese competition in two years' time. The problem is similar in steel and engineering. Without new blast-furnaces, foundries, and heavy electric engineering plant, British engineering cannot build the permanent export trade required: it is merely filling the gap till American industry and German heavy industry, American-owned, is ready to take over.

The Labour movement still has it in its power to arrest the Tory come-back and to save Britain's independence. But only fundamental changes in policy can do this—above all, a break with the American alliance and a turn toward economic and political co-operation with the Soviet Union and the new Europe; and at home, more power for the working people, stricter control and heavier taxation on the rich, speeding of nationalisation, a national plan for industry. The sharpening opposition in the Labour movement to Government policy was felt in the debate on the King's Speech, John Parker speaking for many when he said the Government was more concerned to conciliate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Opposition than to find a Socialist way out; while in the lobbies hundreds of building workers voiced their union's protest against the housing cuts. This growing Left can win if it unites its forces and really fights for the changes needed in the membership and policy of the Government; if it stands firm against the anti-Communist barrage now being organised; above all, if it goes out and puts its alternative fearlessly before the mass of the people, and brings them into the battle.

WHAT HAPPENED IN 1939

[From Vishinsky's speech to the Political Committee of the United Nations Assembly, 25th October, 1947.]

MR. McNEIL referred to Generalissimo Stalin's speech at the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Mr. McNeil declared that at the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Stalin said that Britain, France and the U.S.A.—that was in March, 1939—were non-aggressive States, and later, in August, 1939, Molotov was already speaking of the imperialist character of the war and of the aggressive intentions of States which were afraid of losing their dominant positions in the world. Mr. McNeil saw a contradiction in this and at the same time asserted that the U.S.S.R. lacked a clear understanding of aggression. Apparently he has forgotten the historical facts which separated March and August and more particularly, October, 1939. In a somewhat ambiguous manner Mr. NcNeil hinted at the treaty of non-aggression signed by the Soviet Union and Germany in August, 1939. I should also like to dwell on this question since, frankly speaking, Mr. McNeil sought to discredit the foreign policy of the Soviet Union by distorting the facts and by falsifying history.

May I briefly recall certain facts. At the end of May, 1939, the British and French Governments approached the Soviet Union with a proposal to provide, in the event of direct aggression against any of the contracting Powers, for mutual assistance between Britain, France and the Soviet Union. These proposals about mutual assistance were presented to us in an astonishingly strange form. They were accompanied with reservations that actually rendered them null and void. These new proposals envisaged assistance by the Soviet Union to five countries to whom Britain and France had already given guarantees, but the proposals failed to mention any assistance from Britain and France to the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—which bordered on the Soviet Union.

This envisaged a situation in which the aggressor—it was Hitler, of course, who was meant as the potential aggressor at that time—could threaten the Soviet Union through the Baltic States, while neither Britain nor France would be obliged to render assistance to the U.S.S.R. In other words, if Hitler were to attack us through Poland or Yugoslavia, we could expect assistance from France and Britain. But

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if he were to attack us through Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, we were not entitled to assistance either from France or from Britain. Consequently, in response to the Anglo-French proposal, the Soviet Government insisted on: first, the conclusion of an effective treaty of mutual assistance between Britain, France and the U.S.S.R; secondly, assistance both to the five countries which were granted an Anglo-French guarantee (Poland, Rumania, Greece, Bulgaria and Turkey) and to the three Baltic States, namely, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, which the British and French were refusing to guarantee.

The just nature of the Soviet demands can be judged from the *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post* of July 8, which contained an article by Mr. Churchill, who urged the immediate conclusion of a tripartite pact with the participation of the Soviet Union, against Hitlerite Germany.

The negotiations conducted in Moscow at that time by Britain and France yielded no result. Presently, I shall explain why. On May 31, 1939, the third session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. was convened. And it was at that session—in the month of May—for some reason Mr. McNeil failed to mention this important date—that Mr. Molotov, Soviet Foreign Minister, made a report on foreign policy and said (I am quoting an abridged record):

"If they really desire to establish an efficient front of the peace-loving countries against aggression, then the following conditions are an indispensable minimum: The conclusion of an effective pact of mutual assistance against aggression, between Britain, France and the U.S.S.R., a pact of an exclusively defensive character; guarantees in the event of attack by aggressors, from Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. to the Central and East European States, including all European countries without exception, which border on the U.S.S.R.: the conclusion of a concrete agreement between Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. regarding the form and scale of immediate and effective assistance to be rendered to each other and to the guaranteed States, in the event of attack by an aggressor.

"That is our opinion which we impose on none but by which we stand. We do not insist that others accept our viewpoint and we ask no one to do so. However, we believe that this viewpoint really conforms to the interests of the security of peace-loving States."

This was the stand which Molotov defended then.

Did that really contradict what Stalin said at the 18th Party Congress in March, 1939, when he declared that Great Britain, the U.S.A. and France were not aggressor States? There never was nor could there be any contradiction in this. Mr. McNeil had to bring in an alleged contradiction in order to divert attention from the cardinal task, in order to try and confuse the issue. The conditions advanced by the Soviet Union at that time, in 1939, with a view to preventing war, did not meet with a favourable response.

Having guaranteed themselves from direct attack on the part of the aggressor by means of pacts of mutual assistance between themselves and Poland, and having secured for themselves assistance in the event of the aggressor attacking Poland and Rumania, the British and French left open the question which was bound to be of concern to the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The question was whether or not the Soviet Union could, in its turn, rely on assistance from Britain and France in case Hitler should attack the other countries bordering on the Soviet Union. That question remained open. And, of course, in these conditions one could not expect that Britain and France were seriously negotiating a defensive treaty with the real intention of curbing the aggressor.

It was for this reason that Molotov, referring to the Anglo-French proposals, characterised them as a progressive step, even in the conditions prevailing at the time, but at the same time remarked that this step was accompanied by such reservations that it might prove to be a "fictitious, progressive step."

Those restrictions deprived Britain, France and the Soviet Union of any opportunity of reaching agreement regarding a defensive alliance against Hitler. Naturally, not only those reservations stood in the way, but also the refusal to accept conditions which could really guarantee the Soviet Union from attack by Hitler and which would be the same as those that had already been fixed in the defensive treaties concluded by Great Britain with Poland as well as with Rumania and Turkey.

At long last the commission arrived in Moscow for negotiations. They went six days and nights, travelling when they could have taken only several hours had they come by plane, as we suggested, and not by cargo and passenger boat sailing at 13 knots. Moreover, those representatives of Great Britain and France proved to be second-rate officials, arriving without due authority to negotiate a defensive alliance with the Soviet Union.

What could be the outcome of all this? Nothing. And questioned on this score, the Chairman of the Soviet delegation, Marshal Voroshilov, plainly replied that these negotiations with the British and French military missions ended in failure because the Soviet military mission believed that the U.S.S.R., having no common frontier with the aggressor, could render assistance to France, Britain and Poland only provided her troops had a right of passage through Polish territory.

But the Polish Government declared that it could not consent to the passage of Soviet troops in the event of Hitler aggression and that it generally was in no need of Soviet assistance nor would it accept any assistance from the Soviet Union. Naturally, under those conditions the negotiations failed.

Meanwhile, reports appeared in the British press about negotiations between Germany and Great Britain regarding a guaranteed loan and joint exploitation of the African colonies.

We declare plainly and straightforwardly: proceeding from all those facts our Government and the entire Soviet public gathered at that time the clear impression that the red tape in the negotiations with the U.S.S.R. was started by the Governments of Chamberlain and Daladier for a definite reason, and that Chamberlain and Daladier, with their diplomatic service, were playing an underhand

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

game. On the one hand they pretended their willingness to conclude a treaty with the Soviet Union for defence against Hitler; on the other hand, behind the back of the Soviet Union, they were negotiating with Hitler, selling Europe to Hitler in Munich and preparing a situation which would guarantee Hitler successful attack on the Soviet Union. We were quite conscious that the underhand game was taking place. And it was then, in those conditions, that Hitler suggested a peace treaty with us. We concluded that treaty since it was vitally necessary to us. This produced a veritable storm of fury against the Soviet Union.

But the Soviet Union was correct. The U.S.S.R. refused to be drawn into a conflict by the war provocateurs who, as Molotov said at the third session of the Supeme Soviet, were accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them. The non-aggression treaty was essentially important to the U.S.S.R. as a means of preventing, or delaying aggression for a more or less considerable time, which we used with credit to strengthen our armed forces and the might of the Soviet State, so as to be ready to defeat the Germans at the gates of Moscow in December, 1941, to smash the Germans at Stalingrad in 1942 and by May, 1945, to enter Berlin, over which the victorious Soviet banner was raised.

On July 3, 1941, when the western part of Russia was already enveloped in the terrible conflagration started by the Hitlerite invasion, our leader, Stalin, in a radio message, called upon the people to crush the enemy. He said:

"It may be asked how could the Soviet Government have consented to conclude a non-aggression pact with such perfidious people, such fiends as Hitler and Ribbentrop. Was this not an error on the part of the Soviet Government? Of course not! Non-aggression pacts are pacts of peace between two States.

"It was such a pact that Germany proposed to us in 1939. Could the Soviet Government have declined such a proposal? I think that not a single peace-loving State could decline a peace treaty with a neighbouring State even though the latter were headed by such monsters and cannibals as Hitler and Ribbentrop. But that, of course, only on the one indispensable condition—that this peace treaty did not jeopardise, either directly or indirectly, the territorial integrity, independence and honour of the peace-loving State. As is well known, the non-aggression pact between Germany and the U.S.S.R. was precisely such a pact.

"What did we gain, Stalin asked, by concluding the non-aggression pact with Germany? We secured for our country peace for a year and a half and the opportunity of preparing our forces to repulse Fascist Germany should she risk attack on our country despite the pact. This was a definite advantage for us and a disadvantage for Fascist Germany."

Such, Mr. McNeil, is the history of the contradictions, which, according to your imagination, existed between the position expounded by Marshal Stalin and that expounded in October and in August by Mr. Molotov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. I was obliged to recall this at some length in order to eliminate for the future any opportunity for insinuations, any attempts to distort the actual developments, to falsify history by making the Soviet Union's rôle appear absolutely different from reality.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARX AND ENGELS SPEAK IN LONDON

Marx and Engels took part in the Communist Congress (held in London 29th November to 10th December, 1847) which, on the basis of full discussions, gave Marx the task of working out a Manifesto of the Communist Party. In the latter half of December, Marx, back in Brussels, was working on this. Reports of other activities in which Marx and Engels participated appeared in the 4th December issue of the Chartist paper, the "Northern Star," from which the extracts in quotation marks are taken.

A public meeting to celebrate the anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1840 at the German Society's Hall, Drury Lane, was held on 29th November ("the room was crowded with natives of England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, Belgium and Poland. Mr. John Arnott was elected president"), and after speeches by Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Ernest Jones and M. Michelot, Carl Schapper ended by saying:

"Who were the conspirators now? Why, Metternich, the bloodless old spider in France, Lord Palmerston, and the Jesuits. (Loud cheers.) But the people would very quickly put down their conspiracy. (Great cheering.) He had some glorious news for them, a Democratic Society, that was a Society of Fraternal Democrats, had been established in Brussels, and that society had sent a deputy, the learned Dr. Marx, to represent them at this meeting. (Great applause.) Citizen Schapper here read the following document:

"*To the Members of the Society of Fraternal Democrats Assembling in London.*

"We, the undersigned members of the committee of the Democratic Society, established at Brussels, for advancing the Union and Fraternity of all Nations, have the honour to delegate to you, Dr. Charles Marx, vice-president of this committee, for the purpose of establishing relations of correspondence and sympathy between the two societies. Mr. Marx has full power to act in the name of this committee for the purposes above mentioned.

"We present to you our fraternal salutations . . ."

Dr. MARX, the delegate from Brussels, then came forward, and was greeted with every demonstration of welcome, and delivered an energetic oration in the German language, the substance of which was as follows:

"He had been sent by the Democrats of Brussels to speak in their name to the Democrats of London, and through them to the Democrats of Britain, to call on them to cause to be holden a congress of nations—a congress of working men, to establish liberty all over the world. (Loud cheers.) The middle classes, the Free Traders, had held a congress, but their fraternity was a one-sided one, and the moment they found that such congresses were likely to benefit working men, that moment their fraternity would cease, and their congresses be dissolved. (Hear, hear.) The Democrats of Belgium felt that the Chartists of England were the real Democrats, and that the moment they carried the six points of their Charter, the road to liberty would be opened to the whole world.

"Effect this grand object, then, you working men of England," said the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speaker, "and you will be hailed as the saviours of the whole human race." (Tremendous cheering.)

JULIAN HARNEY moved the next resolution as follows:—

"That this meeting rejoices to learn of the establishment of a Society of Fraternal Democrats in Brussels, and responding to the alliance offered by that society, receives its delegate, Dr. Marx, with every feeling of fraternal regard; and this meeting hails with exultation the proposition to hold a Democratic Congress of all nations, pledging itself to send delegates to that Congress whenever summoned by the Fraternal Democratic Societies of London and Brussels."

CHARLES KEEN moved the fourth resolution as follows:

"That recognising the brotherhood of all men, we consider it our duty to struggle for the triumph of democratic principles in all countries, and believing that the establishment of the 'People's Charter' would enable the people of Great Britain to afford aid to the Polish cause, more effective than the paper 'protests' hitherto employed by the British Government, we hail with joy the prospect of an energetic effort on the part of the British people to obtain the legislative recognition and parliamentary enactment of their long-withheld rights and franchises."

CITIZEN ENGELS (from Paris), in seconding the resolution, said:

"Fellow Citizens, this commemoration of the Polish Revolution is not only an advantage to Poland but to the whole world, as it causes the principles of democracy to be spread far and wide. (Hear, hear.) He, as a German, had great interest in Polish success, as it would much hasten liberty in Germany, and freedom Germany had resolved to obtain sooner or later. (Loud cheers.) And he firmly believed that no one nation could become free without benefiting all others.

"He had resided for some time in England, and was proud to boast himself a Chartist 'name and all.' (Great cheering.) Who were now their chief oppressors? Not the aristocracy, but the wealth takers and scrapers, the middle-classes. (Loud cheers.) Hence, it was the duty of the working classes of all nations to unite and establish freedom for all. (Rapturous applause.)"

BOUND VOLUMES, 1947

Bound volumes this year will be put in hand immediately, and the cost will be £1. Readers who wish to exchange their loose copies for a bound volume can do so at a cost of 8/6.

Will all readers, therefore, who wish to exchange their loose copies for a Bound Volume, please send us a parcel containing:

1. A complete set of loose copies, clean and unmarked. (This is insisted upon, as it is impossible for readers to get their own sets back after binding).
2. A crossed Postal Order or cheque for 8/6.
3. A sheet of paper with your name and address on it. This should also appear on the label, together with the words "Bound Volume."
4. Nothing else whatever, i.e., please do not write on other subjects.

Be very sure the parcel is correctly addressed, securely packed and tied with string and sufficiently stamped (7d).

The last date for receiving these parcels is December 15th, 1947.

LABOUR MONTHLY - - - - 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION AGAINST WARMONGERS

At the plenary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 18 last, Mr. A. Y. Vyshinsky moved the following resolution on behalf of the Soviet delegation:

1. The United Nations organisation condemns the criminal propaganda for a new war, conducted by reactionary circles in a number of countries, in particular in the United States of America, Turkey, and Greece, by means of dissemination of all kinds of fabrications through the press, radio, films, public speeches containing undisguised appeals for an attack on peace-loving, democratic countries.

2. The United Nations organisation regards permission of, and the more so support for, such propaganda for a new war, which inevitably will become a third world war, as a violation of the duty assumed by the members of U.N.O., the Charter of which demands 'the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace' and 'not to endanger international peace, security and justice.' (Article 1, Para. 2; Article 2, Para. 3).

3. The United Nations organisation believes it necessary to urge the Governments of all countries to forbid, under pain of criminal punishment, propaganda for war in any form, and to take measures to prevent and stop propaganda for war as an activity dangerous to the public and threatening the vital interests and well-being of the peace-loving peoples.

4. The organisation of the United Nations reaffirms the necessity for the earliest implementation of the decision of the General Assembly of December 14, 1946, on the reduction of armaments, and of the decision of the General Assembly of January 24, 1946, concerning the exclusion from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other basic armaments destined for mass destruction, and believes that the implementation of these decisions meets the interests of all peace-loving peoples and would constitute the strongest blow at the propaganda and instigators of a new war.

✦ ✦ ✦

In spite of opposition from the United States delegation, whose representative demanded that the Soviet proposals should be "killed" and no time wasted on them, the United Nations Political Committee after eight days' discussion finally adopted the following resolution which was then unanimously endorsed by the General Assembly.

November 3, 1947.

MEASURES TO BE TAKEN AGAINST PROPAGANDA AND INCITERS OF A NEW WAR.

Whereas in the Charter of the United Nations the peoples expressed their determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours,

Whereas the Charter also calls for the promotion of universal respect for, and observance of, fundamental freedoms which include freedom of expression, all members having pledged themselves in Article 56, to take joint and separate action for observance of fundamental freedoms, the General Assembly:

1. Condemns all forms of propaganda, in whatsoever way conducted, which is either designed or likely to provoke or encourage another threat

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression.

2. Requests the Governments of each member to take appropriate steps within its constitutional limits:

(a) to promote, by all means of publicity and propaganda available to them, friendly relations among nations based upon the purposes and principles of the Charter;

(b) to encourage the dissemination of all information designed to give expression to the undoubted desire of all peoples for peace.

3. Directs that this resolution be communicated to the forthcoming conference on freedom of information.

COMMUNICATION

Critical Remarks on F.W. Walbank's "The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West."

PROFESSOR HALDANE'S review of Walbank's book (October issue page 317) seems to overlook a basic weakness of Walbank's analysis. Certainly, this is an interesting study. He points out clearly the main cause of decay of ancient Rome: the inability of a slave society to develop the productive forces. Revealing light is also thrown on the origin of the elements of feudal society in the womb of decaying ancient society. This is an important point which is frequently neglected so that one gets the wrong idea of a mechanical end of the ancient world and the building of an entirely new society by the barbarians.

The weakness of Walbank's analysis, however, is an insufficient analysis of the facts of production, the production relations and, which is only another aspect of the same thing, class relations. Walbank gives a lot of details about the development of trade, but hardly anything about the way in which commodities for this trade were produced. Walbank uses the expressions "bourgeoisie" and "capitalism" freely as if large scale production and trade were the only characteristics of capitalism. This ignoring of the essential difference between slave labour and wage labour blurs the whole analysis. (p. 30 there is an odd suggestion that "normal" capitalism with free labour preceded slavery!) Wage labour is mentioned in various contexts: on p. 40 we are told that rising wages were a sign of decline in 1st and 2nd centuries A.D.; on p. 45 we are told that masses were driven to strikes and insurrection by falling wages in the 3rd century.

As the essential differences between slave society and capitalist society are not sufficiently analysed, analogies —which certainly exist and are very interesting—are over-stated.

Walbank writes, "Between the two systems of modern fascism and the Roman Corporative State there is complete political, social and cultural correspondence." (p. 76). A despotic State power trying to conserve a decaying social system by regimentation, control, etc., certainly affords an interesting analogy to modern fascism. But to make the comparison scientifically valuable, the differences have to be worked out as well. State controlled compulsory organisations of craftsmen and traders, the "collegia" of the Roman Empire (Walbank translates "guilds"), are obviously essentially different from the Fascist "Syndicates" and the Nazi "Labour Front," into which wage earners were forced under the control of capitalists and their agents. Walbank mentions in the same context the branding of "those working in the mines and quarries and in the arms-factories." (p. 49). These were certainly slaves. Their conditions might be compared with those of foreign workers in Hitler's Germany, but workers who are not allowed to change their job in a war economy are still far from being slaves in the proper sense.

Fascism arises when tremendous productive forces have developed and, as they cannot be made use of for the needs of the working people, are turned to the purpose of expansion by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war. Roman decay sets in when expansion has ended, the State squeezes the subject masses—and to a certain extent the rich upper class which Walbank calls the "bourgeoisie"—for the purpose of maintaining a top-heavy parasitical superstructure built on an insufficient basis of productivity.

Walbank fails to see this difference. He ascribes to the Roman Empire the same need to find external markets which is a driving force of modern capitalism. (p. 79). Slave society needed war and expansion to get its labour force and—with the growing decay of the ruling nation which became ever less able to produce what they needed—also subject nations to pay tributes. This is quite a different thing from the capitalist development of tremendous productive forces which cannot be used without expansion.

Professor Haldane in his review asks the question, "Why could Rome not take the course of China which outlived Rome by nearly 2,000 years?" The answer obviously is that Chinese society was fundamentally different from ancient Roman slave society, and that Marx was right when he distinguished "Asiatic society" both from Ancient society and from Feudalism. A comparison between slave society and Asiatic society (with its state-controlled agriculture based on irrigation) would also make it clear that low productivity, combined with stagnation of technique, alone does not account for the downfall of a social system. For these conditions prevailed under various circumstances for thousands of years. It is the combination of low productivity with a rich, powerful, luxurious, parasitical upper class and the costly state apparatus this class needs which leads to the decline of slave society.

Having made this criticism, it is only fair to add that Walbank closes on the note that the decline of ancient society need not find an analogy in the decline of modern civilisation and that he hints at the Socialist solution of the crisis of our time.

J. WINTERNITZ.

(Other letters, including one from S. Mill, also raised points of criticism of F. W. Walbank's book.—Ed. L.M.).

Book Reviews

Good Books on the Yugoslavs

The Watershed, by A. Calder-Marshall (Contact Publications, 8*s* 6*d,* 216 pp.).

Partisan Picture, by Basil Davidson (Bedford Books, 18*s,* 351 pp.).

WHERE there are no maps, we must rely on travellers' tales. When contours are rapidly changing, the observer can best perform his function by recording the landscape or as much of it as he can see, at whatever moment he happens to see it. Later, when the cartographer can get to work, we shall understand his map all the better for having made ourselves familiar with the appearance of the valley while the stream was still finding its bed, or with the plain when the crop had been sown, but had not yet matured.

This is the attitude of both these writers about the early days of the new Yugoslavia. Mr. Calder-Marshall is explicit, and I have borrowed the metaphor from him. After the war, he says, "the fundamental laws of social geography remain the same. But the social, political and economic watersheds are quite different . . . We are like men exploring the earth after a cataclysm, but with the old maps."

The author of "The Watershed" visited Yugoslavia for a few weeks, soon after the end of the war, to make a film for the C.O.I. ("The Bridge"). The book is clearly a write-up of his own diary, about the places he visited and the people he met, full of detail about their behaviour and their talk. For those who do not know the immediate historical background to the period of reconstruction during which the author was in Yugoslavia, there is a well-informed chapter that gives a brief outline of the events that led up to the invasion and the partisan resistance. But the most

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

informative passages in the book are the lighter ones. Mr. Calder-Marshall is at his best when he is spotlighting the conventions and manners of the rapidly changing society which he found. I particularly recommend the brilliant short story of Percival, the Tommy from the British Military Mission, and his lady, the girl who had trouble with OZNA. There were some things in the new Yugoslavia which Mr. Calder-Marshall found irritating. Chief among them was a Mr. Alnuli. The author got tired of him; so does the reader.

Mr. Davidson's book, giving the author's experiences when he was a British Liaison Officer with the partisans, is the only reliable account published in English so far of the earlier stage in the revolution that is still in progress. The length of his stay and the circumstances of his job, gave him access to people and to written records which enabled him to see a wider picture. Of a dozen qualities which make it compulsory reading for the serious student, I would single out two. First, the excellent account of the workings of new institutions, like the "odbor" system (People's Committees), which later became the foundation of the new state. Secondly, the studies of individuals are neither odd snippets of conversation put in for the sake of local colour, nor thinly dramatised projections of the author's own opinions about the people he is describing; they are nearly all carefully selected records about people, who were going through a rapid process of personal development, conscious of what was happening to them as they changed their own relationships towards society. This is an aspect of revolutions that is rarely chronicled. Yet the Yugoslav example provides an enormous field for study from this angle. Mr. Davidson, by translating back into terms of personal motivation the slogans and catchwords that are in danger of degenerating into clichés, has made an important contribution to the task of dispelling ignorance about the origins of the new Yugoslavia.

KENNETH SYERS.

Primers for the Age of Plenty, No. 4

Edited by
LANCELOT HOGBEN

History of the Homeland

HENRY HAMILTON

A new and exciting English history, dealing with human needs and other questions that matter today.

There are chapters on the Land, Food, Clothes, Health, Commerce and Labour. It deals with the British Empire, the Rise of Capitalism in Britain and America, the Labour Movement, and the Rise of the Professions. It also recalls the story of Education and Man's changing Moral values.

The book is oversubscribed, but copies are available at booksellers.

Illustrated. 600 pages.
18s. net

George Allen & Unwin Ltd

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Strengthening Anglo-Soviet Friendship

Life in Russia by John Lawrence (Allen & Unwin, 12*s* 6*d*, 245 pp.).

WHEN I visited the U.S.S.R. recently with a British Soviet Society delegation, we organised a brains trust with our Soviet friends asking us questions about life in England. At the end a Russian girl got up and asked us to express the thanks of many thousand Soviet people for *British Ally*, the British weekly newspaper published in Moscow.

Even in these days of strained relations, *British Ally* is still being published and is awaited with eagerness all over the Soviet Union.

Reading this volume of reminiscences by John Lawrence, who edited *British Ally* during the war, it is easy to understand why he won the friendship of his readers. Unlike so many British officials in Russia, he did not confine himself to the narrow circle round the British Embassy. He saw the Russians in their homes and at their work. He watched them battling with shortages and hunger. He noted their human failings as well as their triumphant enthusiasm. Lawrence sensed from his contact with the ordinary people of Russia the simple underlying fact about life in that great country—that behind the grim conditions of today, behind the hardships which certain newspaper correspondents are so eager to trumpet abroad, is an unswerving conviction that the whole nation is building for a better future.

This book can do much to strengthen the friendship between our countries.

GORDON SCHAFFER.

LABOUR MONTHLY XMAS GIFT TOKEN

Readers: Note the form on the inside front cover. By this scheme readers who take out annual subscriptions for friends at home or abroad may do so at reduced rates. Two annual subscriptions go for a guinea and three annual subscriptions for thirty shillings.

UPTON SINCLAIR'S
Latest success

A World to Win
(1940-1942)

The Seventh Volume in his "World's End" Series

15/- net

"The mixture is delectable . . . as before: novelised history on the grand scale."
Sunday Times.

"Mr. Sinclair keeps it up; his Red China is as good as anything in the Budd Series."
HAROLD BRIGHOUSE in *The Manchester Guardian.*

"One never ceases to be amazed at the largeness of the novelist's view, and the skill with which he weaves his famous character, Lanny Budd, into the complex pattern of world politics . . . subtle and entirely satisfying blend of fact and fiction . . . (The *"World's End"* Series) will surely take a unique place among the great narrative masterpieces of their time."
Liverpool Daily Post.

"There is no flagging in the industry and virtuosity with which Mr. Sinclair chronicles the amazing career of Lanny Budd."
Birmingham Post.

T. WERNER LAURIE LTD.
187 Piccadilly, London, W.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Study at home for

B.Sc. ECON.

Men and women who wish to prepare for post-war opportunities should obtain the London University B.Sc. Econ. degree. It is a valuable qualification not only for teaching or administrative posts under Education authorities, but also for statistical, research, and welfare work in commerce, industry, and T.U. organisation. The degree is open to all. Prepare for it at home under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall; tuition fees are moderate, and may be paid by instalments, if desired. 501 Wolsey Hall Students passed London B.Sc. Econ. Final (External) Examinations, 1925 - 46.

Prospectus post free from

C. D. PARKER, M.A., LL.D.,
Director of Studies, Dept. JK17,

WOLSEY HALL, OXFORD

DOBSON

From Caligari To Hitler

SIEGFRIED KRACAUER

Much has been written about the German cinema, in a continual attempt to analyse its exceptional qualities. Dr. Kracauer maintains that in general, the technique, the story content, and the evolution of the films of a nation are fully understood only in relation to the actual psychological pattern of that nation. This book is of value to the student of the film, of psychology and propaganda. It is profound and scholarly, yet eminently readable.

Illustrated by 64 stills. *25s net.*
Ready shortly.

Current book list on request from
12 Park Place, St. James, London, SW1.

Dennis Dobson Limited.

ARE YOU COLLARED BY THE "OLD SCHOOL TIE"?

When the power to speak can free you!

THE ROAD TO SUCCESS

in whatever sphere you choose, business, social life, factory work or the Services—lies indisputably with your ability to SPEAK; not just to say words, but the power to put your thoughts into that forceful, persuasive speech which alone can help you to succeed. You may be able to wear the 'Old School Tie,' and yet find this one of the subjects your high education didn't touch; you may not have had the advantage of a University education and still win your way through to the really Big Things of Life.

WHAT THIS BOOK WILL SHOW YOU

How to address a business meeting.
How to promote business through speech.
How to train your memory.
How to make the right impression.
How to propose and respond to toasts.
How to make an announcement.
How to write better letters.
How to enlarge your vocabulary.
How to develop self-confidence.
How to acquire a winning personality.
How to overcome fear.

LEARN ABOUT THE NEW EASY METHOD

This unique book, "How to Work Wonders with Words," explains how to acquire quickly the ability to speak effectively, develop poise, personality; how to banish timidity, self-consciousness, and lack of confidence.

Write or post coupon NOW for this Amazing Book.

Send Stamp 2d. NOW

THE SPEAKERS' CLUB

(Dept. LNY/ES9), MARPLE, Ches.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SCIENCE & SOCIETY

Volume XI, Number 4, Fall 1947

BERNARD SHAW'S SOCIALISM ..... *E. J. Hobsbawm*

PLANNING FOR SOCIALISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA
Pierre George

MISSISSIPPI RECONSTRUCTION AND THE NEGRO LEADER, CHARLES CALDWELL ..... *Herbert Aptheker*

REVIEWS by Paul M. Sweezy, Kenneth May, John Lewis, Mildred Burgum, S. Bernstein, F. Ewen, Louis Weisner, Alfred Evenitsky.

SUBSCRIBE NOW QUARTERLY 12s 6d a year

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY, 30 East 20th Street, New York 3, N.Y.

British Representatives:

COLLET'S Subscription Dept., 40 Great Russell St., London, W.C.1

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received August 1st to October 31st, 1947: £101 16s 3d

Edwin Greening, 5s; H. A. Birch, 10s; A. Jenkin, 10s; H. G. Kelf, 4s; Mr. A. Bruce, 6s 3d; D. R. Morrison, 4s; A. W. Pearce, 8s; Fred Farrington, 5s; Anon., Whitchurch, 1s; K. Kennedy, 2s 6d; D. F. Oakshott, 10s; Cambridge Branch C.P., £1 4s; Mr. and Mrs. D. N. Humphreys, 3s 6d; C. H. B. Toche, 10s; William Makins, 8s; Harry Welford, 10s; Olivia Greene, £2; J. G. Stewart, 1s; L. Rowan, 6s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; Dr. John Davenport, £2 2s; R. Lawson, 18s; J. A. Purton, 5s; Oliver Pond, 4s; John Bellis, 1s; S. W. Beer, 10s; H. E. Reiss, 8s; E. Nadler, 7s; J. Gubb, 8s; C. Creffield, 8s; Labor Progressive Party, Toronto, 1s 10d; A. Davey, 1s 10d; C. A. Collier 2s; L'Humanité, 2s; G. Ramsay, 6s 6d; R. F. B., £3; B Beale, 1s; A. F. Brazier, 3s; F. J. Rush, 8s; Dr. Cyril Rainbow, 8s; H. A. Percival, 4s; A. E. Perkins, 13s; J. Redfern, 6s; W. F. Lakin-Smith, 2s 6d; E. E. Shepheard, 6s; G. F. Burn, £1; E. Williams, 3s; W. H. Laithwaite, 8s; J. Lipetz, £1; H. S. M., 2s 6d; The Bacon Family, 5s; M. A. Harwel, 7s; R. Royle, 8s; U. S. Truelove, 8s; M. Arnold, £1 8s; F. Seyd, 8s; F. Renouf, 5s; A. H. Bunting, 7s; T. Flood, 2s 6d; F. Wedlake, 2s 6d; Royston Green, 3s 6d; J. J. Christie, 3s; J. T. McGinn, 7s; J. A. Maughan, 8s; R. Bridgeman, 6s; S. Morrissy, 10s; C. Huntley, 2s; M. Dunne, 3s; V. C. Osborne, 5s; L. M. Mills, 3s; C. H. B. Locke, 10s; D. Rees, 10s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; J. D. Mathews, 8s; K. B. Kay, 8s; J. Macdonald, 8s; C. D. Say, 10s; E. M. Addyman, 3s; M. Greenstone, 12s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; R. Trowell, 4s; J. R. Webb, £1 5s; S. Mill, 10s; P. W. Norman, 8s; F. Berry, 8s; G. Warrack, 8s; C. Osmond, £1 4s; Soc. Sailor, 10s; C. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 5s; J. R. Davies, 3s; Director, £2; C. Levy, £2; Mr. and Mrs. Humphreys, 3s 6d; A. Crosby, 8s; Robert McLeod, 5s; L. Rowan, 6s; Anon., Whitchurch, 1s; Royston Green, 3s 6d; C. M. Ford, £1 10s; J. Duffy, 6d; G. S. Robertson, 4s; G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert, £1; S. Mill, 10s; M. F. A. Philibert, 1s; R. J. Finnemore, 8s; L'Humanité, 2s; J. A. Bullard, 3s; Anonymous, 5s; L. Brooks, 2s; T. Flood, 2s 6d; R. F. B., £3; Olivia Greene, £2; Stewart J. McCullock, £2; The Bacon Family, 5s; Mr. Ruffell, 3s; E. E. Godfrey, 12s; R. Austin, 1s; K. Reisz, for K. Konig, 6s 6d; F. A. Mace, 2s; R. Anderson, 5s; F. Wedlake, 2s 6d; D. Percival, 8s; M. Timmins, 8s; T. W. R., £1; D. H. Strathern and friends, 5s; F. Renouf, 5s; H. S. M., 2s 6d; C. Nettleton, 8s; D. E. Bury, 8s; S. Morrissey, 10s; W. F. Lakin-Smith, 2s 6d; J. B., 5s; W. Winsch, 3s; L. J. Martin, 4s; Wm. J. Jones, 8s; T. Kuiranov, 3s; T. Crawford, 8s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; Cambridge Branch C.P., £1 10s; D. Rees, 10s; Miss H. Ross, 8s; Mr. Cameron, Victoria, 5s; B. Soper, £1 8s; G. M. Harrison, £2 5s; T. K. Keating, 5s; H. Haycock, 9s; L. P. Neal, 8s; J. Walkinshaw, 8s; S. Hoyland, 8s; L. Rowan, 6s; Mrs. H. Wolff, 8s; J. L. Jolly, 3s; J. Latham, 8s; W. Wallace, £1; S. Goldstein, 1s; W. Cornelius, 5s; J. J. Trott, 4s; Mr. and Mrs. D. R. Humphreys, 3s 6d; C. D. Say, 5s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; Anon., Whitchurch, 1s; Colin Penn, 18s; Reg. Cottle, Cornwall, 3s; S. Mill, 10s; P. C. C., 8s; A. M., 7s 4d; R. F. B., Doncaster, £3; W. K. Lakin-Smith, 2s 6d; T. Flood, 2s 6d; L'Humanité, 2s; P. H. Maurice, 8s; Dewsbury Socialist Society, 8s; Soc. Sailor, 10s; D. A. Hamilton, 8s; B. Davies, 4s; L. Barnes, 9s; H. F. List, 9s; J. R. Lansley, 8s; G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert, 10s; Royston Green, 3s; H. M. Barnett, 8s; Olivia Greene, £2; A. G. Neville, 7s; H. S. M., 2s 6d; S. Morrissy, 10s; A. Watts, 8s; A. Elliot, 6s 6d; Robert Weare, 8s; M. G. Jenkins, 3s; T. Kilborn, 5s; R. McLeod, 5s; D. H. Strathern, 5s; F. Renouf, 5s; F. Wedlake, 2s 6d; Noel Shaw, 2s; Dr. E. Strachan Rogers, 9s; C. J. L. Hill, 3s; J. B., Chelmsford, 5s; Cambridge Branch C.P., £1 15s; D. Rees, 10s; H. E. Cole, 8s; B. Becker, 8s; Mrs. C. Wrench, 2s 6d; Socialist Sailor, £2; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 5s; Director, £2; J. Sanford, California, £2 9s 1d.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED